

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/816,287 03/21/2001		Vladislav Vashchenko	75292/10417	6106		
759	90 11/12/2004	EXAMINER				
Arter & Hadde Jurgen K. Vollra		PRENTY, MARK V				
588 SUTTER S		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
San Francisco,	CA 94102	•	2822			

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Du

## Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/816,287 Applicant(s)

VASHCHENKO et al.

Examiner

Prenty

Art Unit 2822

Į			Į	1	I	ŀ	ľ		

<del></del>						
		on the cover sheet with the correspondence address				
A SH THE - Extens mailing - If the	ng date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less then thirty (30) days, a reply within the	no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the				
<ul> <li>Failure</li> <li>Any re</li> </ul>	to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
earnec Status						
1)⊠		2003 .				
28) 🗆	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) 💢 This act	tion is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance eclosed in accordance with the practice under Ex pair	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is arte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposi	ition of Claims					
4) 🔯	Claim(s) 4-6, 17, and 18	is/are pending in the application.				
4	4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) 💢	Claim(s) <u>4-6</u>	is/are allowed.				
6) 🔯	Claim(s) 17 and 18	is/are rejected.				
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.				
8) 🗆	<u> </u>					
Applica	ation Papers					
9) 🗆						
10)□	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d					
11)□	1) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Example approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12)						
	r under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	nei.				
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been received.				
	2.    Certified copies of the priority documents have					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Bures ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
_	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	·				
_	☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional					
		• •				
Attachm	ent(s)					
	ortice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTC-413) Paper No(s).				
_	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
3)     Imt/	formation Disclosure Statement(a) (PTO-1449) Paper No(a).	6) U Other:				

This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed May 14, 2003. That amendment has been entered.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art Fig. 1 together with Huang (newly cited United States Patent 6,509,585).

With respect to independent claim 17, Prior Art Fig. 1 illustrates an SCR ESD protection structure 100 which includes a semiconductor material 110 of a first conductivity type, the semiconductor material having a dopant concentration; a well 112 of a second conductivity type formed in the semiconductor material, the well having a dopant concentration; a first region 114 of the second conductivity type formed in the well, the first region having a dopant concentration greater than the dopant concentration of the well, the first region being connected to a first node 120; a second region 116 of the first conductivity type formed in the well, the second region having a dopant concentration greater than the dopant concentration of the semiconductor material, the second region being connected to the first node; a third region 122 of the second conductivity type formed in the semiconductor material, the third region having a dopant concentration greater than the dopant concentration of the well, the third region being connected to a second node 126, and a fourth region 124 of the first conductivity type formed in the semiconductor material, the fourth region having a dopant concentration greater than the dopant concentration of the semiconductor material, the fourth region being connected to the second node.

The difference between Prior Art Fig. 1's SCR ESD protection structure and claim 1 is claim 1 recites adjusting the holding (latchup) voltage of its SCR ESD protection structure by adjusting the size of the second region.

Huang teaches adjusting the holding (latchup) voltage of an SCR ESD

protection structure by adjusting the size of its second region. More specifically, Huang teaches advantageously lowering the holding (latchup) voltage of an SCR ESD protection structure (the advantage being that the ESD protection turns on more easily) by increasing the size of the second region at the ESD-event pad (see the entire patent, particularly column 3, line 16, through column 4, line 5, and note Fig. 5's analogous second region 104a).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in this art to adjust (lower) the holding (latchup) voltage of Prior Art Fig. 1's SCR ESD protection structure by adjusting (increasing) the size of second region 116, in order to have the ESD protection turn on more easily as taught by Huang.

Claim 17 is thus rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art Fig. 1 together with Huang.

With respect to dependent claim 18, Huang further teaches that the holding (latchup) voltage of an SCR ESD protection structure can also be advantageously lowered (again, the advantage being that the ESD protection turns on more easily) by increasing the size of the third region at the ESD-event pad (see the entire patent, particularly column 3, line 16, through column 4, line 5, and note Fig. 5's analogous third region 102a).

It would have been further obvious to one skilled in this art to adjust (lower) the holding (latchup) voltage of Prior Art Fig. 1's SCR ESD protection structure by also adjusting (increasing) the size of third region 122, in order to have the ESD protection turn on more easily as taught by Huang.

Claim 18 is thus rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art Fig. 1 together with Huang.

Claims 4-6 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Registered practitioners can telephone examiner Prenty at (703) 308-4939. Any voicemail message left for the examiner must include the name and registration number of the registered practitioner calling, and the application's Serial Number. Technology Center 2800's general telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Mark Prenty Mark V. Procisy Primery Exemples